

A CRITERION FOR RINGS WHICH ARE LOCALLY VALUATION

KAMRAN DIVAANI-AAZAR, MOHAMMAD ALI ESMKHANI AND MASSOUD TOUSI

ABSTRACT. Using the notion of cyclically pure injective modules, a characterization for rings which are locally valuation is established. As applications, new characterizations for Prüfer domains and pure semi-simple rings are provided. Namely, we show that a domain R is Prüfer if and only if two of the three classes of pure injective, cyclically pure injective and RD-injective modules are equal. Also, we prove that a commutative ring R is pure semi-simple if and only if every R -module is cyclically pure injective.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, R denotes a commutative ring with identity, and all modules are assumed to be left unitary. The notion of pure injective modules has a substantial role in commutative algebra and model theory. Among various generalizations of this notion, the notion of cyclically pure injective modules has been extensively studied by M. Hochster [9] and L. Melkersson [12]. Recall that an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules and R -homomorphisms is said to be *cyclically pure* if the induced map $R/\mathfrak{a} \otimes_R A \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{a} \otimes_R B$ is injective for all (finitely generated) ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ of R . Also, an R -module D is said to be *cyclically pure injective* if for any cyclically pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, the induced homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(B, D) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, D)$ is surjective. In the sequel, we use the abbreviation CP for the term “cyclically pure”.

More generally, let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of R -modules. An exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules and R -homomorphisms is said to be $\mathcal{S}$ -pure if for all $M \in \mathcal{S}$, the induced homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(M, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, C)$ is surjective. An R -monomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be $\mathcal{S}$ -pure if the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{\text{nat}} B/f(A) \rightarrow 0$ is $\mathcal{S}$ -pure. An R -module D is said to be $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective if for any $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, the induced homomorphism

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13F05, 13F30.

Key words and phrases. Absolutely pure modules, cyclically pure injective modules, projective principal rings, Prüfer domains, semi-hereditary rings, semi-simple rings, valuation rings.

The first author was supported by a grant from IPM (No. 84130213).

The third author was supported by a grant from IPM (No. 85130213).

$\text{Hom}_R(B, D) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, D)$ is surjective, see [13]. When $\mathcal{S}$ is the class of finitely presented R -modules, $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact sequences and $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective modules are called pure exact sequences and pure injective modules, respectively. If $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the class of all R -modules of the form $R/Rr, r \in R$, then $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact sequences and $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective modules are called RD-exact sequences and RD-injective modules, respectively. For a survey on the notions of pure injective and RD-injective modules, we refer the reader to [6].

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the class of all R -modules M for which there is a cyclic submodule G of R^n , for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that M is isomorphic to R^n/G . In [3], we showed that CP-exact sequences and CP-injective modules coincide with $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact sequences and $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective modules, respectively. In the same paper we have systematically investigated the structure of CP-injective modules and presented several characterizations of this class of modules. Our aim in this paper is the following:

- i) Classifying the commutative rings that over which the two notions of “RD-injective” and “cyclically pure injective” coincide.
- ii) Classifying the commutative rings that over which the two notions of “pure injective” and “cyclically pure injective” coincide.

In Section 2, we show that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a valuation ring for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R if and only if every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective, if and only if every pure injective R -module is CP-injective. From this we obtain a characterization for semi-hereditary rings and also one for Prüfer domains. In the literature, there are several characterizations for Prüfer domains. In particular, by [6, Chapter XIII, Theorem 2.8], it is known that a domain R is Prüfer if and only if every pure injective R -module is RD-injective. Also, it is known by [6, Chapter IX, Proposition 3.4] that a domain R is Prüfer if and only if every divisible R -module is absolutely pure. Here we show that a domain R is Prüfer if and only if every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective, if and only if every pure injective R -module is CP-injective. Also, we show that a domain R is Prüfer if and only if every absolutely CP-module is absolutely pure. Finally, a new characterization for pure semi-simple rings is given. We show that a ring R is pure semi-simple if and only if every R -module is CP-injective, if and only if every R -module is RD-pure injective.

The first example of a CP-exact sequence which is not pure was presented in [1]. Our first characterization for Prüfer domains mentioned above shows that over a non-Prüfer domain R the class of CP-injective R -modules is strictly larger than that of RD-injective R -modules and strictly smaller than that of pure injective R -modules. However, these may be viewed as kind of implicit strict inclusions. In Section 3, we provide some examples for which we can explicitly show proper containments in this regard. In [3], we proved that

in many aspects CP-injective modules behave similar to pure injective and RD-injective modules. But Remark 2.2 and Example 3.5 below display some differences between the former class and the later two.

2. A CHARACTERIZATION FOR PRÜFER RINGS

In the remainder of this paper, let $\mathcal{S}_1$ denote the class of all R -modules of the form $R/Rr, r \in R$. Also, let $\mathcal{S}_4$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_2$) denote the class of all finitely presented (resp. finitely presented cyclic) R -modules. Finally, we let $\mathcal{S}_3$ denote the class of all R -modules M for which there are an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a cyclic submodule G of R^n such that M is isomorphic to R^n/G .

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of R -modules. An exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules and R -homomorphisms is called $\mathcal{S}$ -flat if for all $M \in \mathcal{S}$ the induced map $A \otimes_R M \rightarrow B \otimes_R M$ is injective.

Remark 2.2. Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of R -modules and R -homomorphisms.

- i) For $i = 1, 4$, the above exact sequence is $\mathcal{S}_i$ -pure if and only if it is $\mathcal{S}_i$ -flat, see [13, Propositions 2 and 3].
- ii) By [3, Proposition 2.2], the above exact sequence is $\mathcal{S}_3$ -pure if and only if it is $\mathcal{S}_2$ -flat.

Example 3.5 in the next section, shows that there exists an $\mathcal{S}_2$ -flat exact sequence which is not $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pure.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a class of R -modules. An R -module P is said to be $\mathcal{S}$ -pure projective if for any $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, the induced homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(P, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P, C)$ is surjective.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be two classes of R -modules. The following are equivalent:

- i) Every $\mathcal{T}$ -pure exact sequence is $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact.
- ii) Every $\mathcal{S}$ -pure projective R -module is $\mathcal{T}$ -pure projective.
- iii) Every element of $\mathcal{S}$ is a direct summand of a direct sum of modules in $\mathcal{T}$.

Moreover, if $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are both contained in $\mathcal{S}_4$, then the above conditions are equivalent to the following

- iv) Every $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective R -module is $\mathcal{T}$ -pure injective.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a class of R -modules. By the definition every element of $\mathcal{U}$ is $\mathcal{U}$ -pure projective. In general, by [13, Proposition 1], it turns out that an R -module M is $\mathcal{U}$ -pure projective if and only if M is a direct summand of a direct sum of modules in $\mathcal{U}$. Hence the equivalence of i), ii) and iii) is immediate.

Next, assume that $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are both contained in $\mathcal{S}_4$. Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_4$ be a class of R -modules and E an injective cogenerator of R . By [5, Lemma 1.2], there is a class $\mathcal{U}^*$ of R -modules such that an exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$ of R -modules and R -homomorphisms is $\mathcal{U}$ -pure if and only if

$$0 \longrightarrow A \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow B \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow C \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact for all $M^* \in \mathcal{U}^*$. Thus by using adjoint property, it follows that $\text{Hom}_R(M^*, E)$ is a $\mathcal{U}$ -pure injective R -module for all $M^* \in \mathcal{U}^*$.

iv) $\Rightarrow$ i) Let $0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0(*)$ be a $\mathcal{T}$ -pure exact sequence and $M^* \in \mathcal{S}^*$ an arbitrary element. Since $\text{Hom}_R(M^*, E)$ is $\mathcal{S}$ -pure injective, it is also $\mathcal{T}$ -pure injective, by our assumption. Thus, by applying the functor $\text{Hom}_R(-, \text{Hom}_R(M^*, E))$ on $(*)$ and using adjoint property, we deduce the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C \otimes_R M^*, E) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(B \otimes_R M^*, E) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A \otimes_R M^*, E) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Thus, it turns out that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow B \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow C \otimes_R M^* \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. Therefore $(*)$ is $\mathcal{S}$ -pure exact.

Now, since the implication *i) $\Rightarrow$ iv)* clearly holds, the proof is finished. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that every pure injective R -module is CP-injective. Then an exact sequence $l : 0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$ is $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pure exact if and only if it is CP-exact.*

Proof. Assume that l is a CP-exact sequence. Then, by Lemma 2.4, it is pure exact. Hence it is clearly $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pure, because $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_4$.

Now, assume that l is $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pure exact. Let E be an injective cogenerator of R and $(\cdot)^\vee$ denote the faithfully exact functor $\text{Hom}_R(-, E)$. Let $l^\vee$ denote the induced exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow C^\vee \longrightarrow B^\vee \longrightarrow A^\vee \longrightarrow 0$. Let $\mathfrak{J}$ be a finitely generated ideal of R . Since $R/\mathfrak{J}$ is finitely presented, the two R -modules $R/\mathfrak{J} \otimes_R M^\vee$ and $\text{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{J}, M)^\vee$ are naturally isomorphic for all R -modules M . So the exact sequence $l^\vee$ is a CP-exact. Hence $l^\vee$ is pure exact, by Lemma 2.4. Let $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$. Then by Remark 2.2 i), the sequence $N \otimes_R l^\vee$ is exact. The exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow N \otimes_R C^\vee \longrightarrow N \otimes_R B^\vee \longrightarrow N \otimes_R A^\vee \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, C)^\vee \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, B)^\vee \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, A)^\vee \longrightarrow 0$$

are naturally isomorphic. Thus the second sequence is also exact, and so

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, A) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence, because $(\cdot)^\vee$ is a faithfully exact functor. Therefore l is a CP-exact sequence. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal of R . Assume that every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective. Then every CP-injective $R/\mathfrak{a}$ -module is an RD-injective $R/\mathfrak{a}$ -module.*

Proof. Set $T = R/\mathfrak{a}$. Let $M = T^n/V$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and V is a cyclic T -submodule of T^n . So, there are $b_1, \dots, b_n \in R$ such that $V = T(b_1 + \mathfrak{a}, \dots, b_n + \mathfrak{a})$. Let $N = R^n/U$, where $U = R(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. We show that M and $N \otimes_R T$ are naturally isomorphic as T -modules. To this end, let $\phi : M \longrightarrow N \otimes_R T$ be the map defined by

$$(x_1 + \mathfrak{a}, \dots, x_n + \mathfrak{a}) + V \mapsto ((x_1, \dots, x_n) + U) \otimes (1 + \mathfrak{a})$$

for all $(x_1 + \mathfrak{a}, \dots, x_n + \mathfrak{a}) + V \in M$. Also, we define $\psi : N \otimes_R T \longrightarrow M$ by

$$((x_1, \dots, x_n) + U) \otimes (r + \mathfrak{a}) \mapsto (rx_1 + \mathfrak{a}, \dots, rx_n + \mathfrak{a}) + V.$$

It is a routine check to see that ϕ and ψ are well defined T -homomorphisms and that $\psi\phi = id_M$ and $\phi\psi = id_{N \otimes_R T}$. Now, as $- \otimes_R T$ commutes with direct sums, the conclusion is immediate by Lemma 2.4 iii) $\iff$ iv). $\square$

Recall that a *valuation ring* (not necessarily a domain) is a commutative ring whose ideals are linearly ordered under inclusion.

Theorem 2.7. *The following are equivalent:*

- i) $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a valuation ring for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R .
- ii) Every pure injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iii) Every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iv) Every pure injective R -module is CP-injective.
- v) Every pure projective R -module is RD-projective.
- vi) Every CP-projective R -module is RD-projective.
- vii) Every pure projective R -module is CP-projective.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, the equivalences ii) $\iff$ v), iii) $\iff$ vi) and iv) $\iff$ vii) are obvious. Also, the implications ii) $\Rightarrow$ iii) and ii) $\Rightarrow$ iv) are clear.

i) $\Rightarrow$ v) As we have mentioned in the proof Lemma 2.4, for a given class $\mathcal{U}$ of R -modules, an R -module M is $\mathcal{U}$ -pure projective if and only if M is a direct summand of a direct sum of modules in $\mathcal{U}$. So, to deduce v), it is enough to show that every finitely presented R -module is RD-projective. By [6, Proposition 4], a finitely presented R -module M is RD-projective if and only if $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is an RD-projective $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -module for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R . Hence v) follows by [15, Theorem 1].

v) $\Rightarrow$ i) follows by [13, Proposition 1] and [15, Theorem 3].

iii) $\Rightarrow$ i) Assume that there exists a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R so that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not a valuation ring. Let $N = (R_{\mathfrak{p}})^n / G$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and G is a cyclic $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -submodule of $(R_{\mathfrak{p}})^n$. Clearly N is equal to the localization at $\mathfrak{p}$ of an element of $\mathcal{S}_3$. Hence, as localization at $\mathfrak{p}$ commutes with direct sums, by Lemma 2.4, we may and do assume that R is a local ring which is not a valuation ring. Denote by $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal of R . Since R is not a valuation ring, there are two elements $a, b \in R$ such that $Ra \not\subseteq Rb$ and $Rb \not\subseteq Ra$. Set $\mathfrak{J} := ma + mb$. Lemma 2.6 yields that every CP-injective $R/\mathfrak{J}$ -module is an RD-injective $R/\mathfrak{J}$ -module. Replace R, a and b by $R/\mathfrak{J}, a + \mathfrak{J}$ and $b + \mathfrak{J}$, respectively. So we can assume that R is a local ring which is not a valuation ring and that there are two elements $a, b \in R$ such that $Ra \not\subseteq Rb, Rb \not\subseteq Ra, ma = mb = 0$ and $Ra \cap Rb = 0$. In view of the proof of [15, Theorem 2], it becomes clear that $M := (R \oplus R)/R(a, -b)$ is a non-cyclic indecomposable R -module. Lemma 2.4 implies that M is a direct summand of a direct sum of cyclic modules. Now, by [14, Proposition 3], over a commutative local ring, any indecomposable direct summand of a direct sum of cyclic modules is cyclic. We achieved at a contradiction.

iv) $\Rightarrow$ i) By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, it follows that every finitely presented R -module is a direct summand of a direct sum of cyclic modules. Now, we assume that i) does not hold and search for a contradiction. Then there is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R so that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not a valuation ring. Hence, by [15, Theorem 2], there exists an indecomposable finitely presented $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module M which is not cyclic. Since every finitely presented $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module is the localization at $\mathfrak{p}$ of a finitely presented R -module, we deduce that M is a direct summand of a direct sum of cyclic $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module. But then by [14, Proposition 3], M should be a cyclic $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module. $\square$

Definition 2.8. i) (See [4]) A ring R is said to be *projective principal ring* (P.P.R.) if every principal ideal of R is projective.

ii) A ring R is said to be *semi-hereditary* if every finitely generated ideal of R is projective.

iii) (See [10]) An R -module M is said to be *absolutely pure* (resp. *absolutely cyclically pure*) if it is pure (resp. cyclically pure) as a submodule in every extension of M .

iv) (See [5]) An R -module M is said to be *divisible* if for every $r \in R$ and $x \in M$, $\text{Ann}_R r \subseteq \text{Ann}_R x$ implies that $x \in rM$. (This is equivalent to the usual definition where R is domain.)

In the proof of the following lemma we use the methods of the proofs of [10, Proposition 1 and Corollary 2].

Lemma 2.9. *Let M be an R -module.*

i) *M is absolutely cyclically pure if and only if $\text{Ext}_R^i(N, M) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$.*

ii) M is absolutely cyclically pure if and only if any diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P' & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & P \\ \downarrow \beta & & \\ M & & \end{array}$$

with P' cyclic, α monic and P projective, there exists a homomorphism $\gamma : P \longrightarrow M$ such that $\gamma\alpha = \beta$.

Proof. i) Let L be an extension of M and $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$. From the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow M \hookrightarrow L \longrightarrow L/M \longrightarrow 0$, we deduce the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, M) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, L) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, L/M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(N, M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(N, L)(*).$$

Assume that M is an absolutely CP-module and let L be an injective extension of M . Then by Remark 2.2 ii) and $(*)$, we conclude that $\text{Ext}_R^1(N, M) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$.

Now, assume that $\text{Ext}_R^1(N, M) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$. Let L be an extension of M . Then Remark 2.2 ii) and $(*)$ imply that the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow M \hookrightarrow L \longrightarrow L/M \longrightarrow 0$ is CP-exact.

ii) We may assume that P is a finitely generated free R -module. Thus the result follows by using i) and the following exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(P, M) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P', M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(P/\alpha(P'), M) \longrightarrow 0. \square$$

Lemma 2.10. *The following are equivalent:*

- i) R is a P.P.R.
- ii) Every cyclic submodule of a projective R -module is projective.
- iii) Every quotient of an absolutely CP-module is also an absolutely CP-module.

Proof. i) $\Leftrightarrow$ ii) follows by [4, Theorem 3.2].

ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ iii) In view of Lemma 2.9, the proof is immediate by adapting the argument of [10, Theorem 2] and replacing the phrases “absolutely pure” and “finitely generated submodule” with “absolutely cyclically pure” and “cyclic submodule”, respectively. $\square$

Corollary 2.11. *Assume that R is a P.P.R. The following are equivalent:*

- i) R is a semi-hereditary ring.
- ii) Every pure injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iii) Every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iv) Every pure injective R -module is CP-injective.
- v) Every divisible R -module is absolutely pure.
- vi) Every absolutely CP-module is absolutely pure.
- vii) Every pure projective R -module is RD-projective.

- viii) Every CP-projective R -module is RD-projective.
- ix) Every pure projective R -module is CP-projective.

Proof. As, we have mentioned in the proof of Theorem 2.7, by Lemma 2.4, the equivalences $ii) \iff vii)$, $iii) \iff viii)$ and $iv) \iff ix)$ are obvious.

Now, assume that R is semi-hereditary. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of R . Then $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is also a semi-hereditary ring. Hence for each nonzero element a of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, the $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module $aR_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a nonzero free $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module. Thus, we conclude that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a domain. But, it is known that a domain is semi-hereditary if and only if it is Prüfer. So $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a valuation domain for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R . Therefore the implication $i) \Rightarrow ii)$ and the equivalences $ii) \Leftrightarrow iii)$ and $iii) \Leftrightarrow iv)$ are immediate by Theorem 2.7.

$ii) \Rightarrow v)$ Let M be a divisible R -module and E denote the injective envelop of M . Then [5, Lemma 2.2] implies that the sequence $0 \longrightarrow M \hookrightarrow E \longrightarrow E/M \longrightarrow 0$, is RD-exact. Hence, by Lemma 2.4, it is pure and so $\text{Ext}_R^1(N, M) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{S}_4$. Thus, by [10, Proposition 1], M is absolutely pure.

$v) \Rightarrow vi)$ Let M be an absolutely CP-module. Then, by Lemma 2.9 i), $\text{Ext}_R^1(N, M) = 0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{S}_3$. In particular, $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/Rr, M) = 0$ for all $r \in R$, and so M is a divisible R -module by [5, Lemma 2.2]. Thus M is absolutely pure, as required.

Finally, we prove $vi) \Rightarrow i)$. Since R is a P.P.R., Lemma 2.10 yields that every quotient of an absolutely CP-module is again an absolutely CP-module. So, if $vi)$ holds, then every quotient of an absolutely pure module is again absolutely pure. Thus $i)$ follows by [10, Theorem 2]. $\square$

Now, since a domain R is Prüfer if and only if it is semi-hereditary, we can obtain the main result of this paper. Note that every domain is a P.P.R.

Corollary 2.12. *Assume that R is a domain. The following are equivalent:*

- i) R is Prüfer.
- ii) Every pure injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iii) Every CP-injective R -module is RD-injective.
- iv) Every pure injective R -module is CP-injective.
- v) Every divisible R -module is absolutely pure.
- vi) Every absolutely CP-module is absolutely pure.
- vii) Every pure projective R -module is RD-projective.
- viii) Every CP-projective R -module is RD-projective.
- ix) Every pure projective R -module is CP-projective.

Let $\mathcal{C}_{RDR}$ denote the class of all RD-injective R -modules. Also, let $\mathcal{C}_{CPR}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{PR}$ denote the class of all CP-injective R -modules and that of all pure injective R -modules, respectively. It follows, by Theorem 2.7 that if two of three classes $\mathcal{C}_{RDR}$, $\mathcal{C}_{CPR}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{PR}$ are equal, then all three classes are equal. The following result shows that if each of these three classes is equal to the class of all R -modules, then the two other classes are also equal to the class of all R -modules. First, we bring a definition.

Definition 2.13. A ring R is said to be *pure-semi simple* if every R -module is a direct sum of finitely generated R -modules.

Theorem 2.14. *The following are equivalent:*

- i) Every R -module is RD-pure injective.
- ii) Every R -module is CP-injective.
- iii) Every R -module is pure injective.
- iv) R is pure-semi simple.

Proof. The implications $i) \Rightarrow ii)$ and $ii) \Rightarrow iii)$ are clear.

Assume that iii) holds. Then every pure exact sequence of R -modules splits, and so it follows from [8] that every R -module is a direct sum of finitely generated R -modules. Thus iii) implies iv).

Now, we prove the implication $iv) \Rightarrow i)$. By [7, Theorem 4.3], R is an Artinian principal ideal ring and every R -module is a direct sum of cyclic R -modules. Hence, since every ideal of R is principal, it follows that every R -module is a direct sum of modules of the form $R/Rr, r \in R$. From this we can conclude that every RD-exact sequence splits. Therefore, every R -module is RD-injective. $\square$

3. SOME EXAMPLES

Theorem 2.7 shows that there exists a ring R such that $\mathcal{C}_{RDR} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_{CPR} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_{PR}$. In this section, we present some explicit examples for these strict containments.

Example 3.1. i) Let $\mathbb{Z}$ be the ring of integers and p a prime integer. Since every ideal of $\mathbb{Z}$ is principal, the two notions of RD-injectivity and of CP-injectivity coincide for $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Hence by [3, Theorem 3.6], $D = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is an RD-injective $\mathbb{Z}$ -module, while it is not an injective $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

ii) By [1, Example 1], there are an Artinian local ring R and an R -algebra S containing R , such that the inclusion map $R \hookrightarrow S$ is cyclically pure, but it is not pure. It is known that every Artinian R -module is pure injective (see e.g. [11, Corollary 4.2]). Hence R is a pure injective R -module. But R is not CP-injective, because otherwise by [3, Theorem 3.4], the inclusion map $R \hookrightarrow S$ splits.

Lemma 3.2. *Let R be a domain, B a torsion free R -module and $0 \longrightarrow K \hookrightarrow B \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$ an exact sequence of R -modules. The following are equivalent:*

- i) M is torsion-free.
- ii) The inclusion map $K \hookrightarrow B$ is RD-pure.

Proof. It is easy to see that an R -module L is torsion free if and only if $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/Rr, L) = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Since B is torsion-free for any $r \in R$, from the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow K \hookrightarrow B \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$, we deduce the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/Rr, M) \longrightarrow (R/Rr) \otimes_R K \longrightarrow (R/Rr) \otimes_R B \longrightarrow (R/Rr) \otimes_R M \longrightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, the assertion follows by Remark 2.2 i). $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let R be a domain and D an RD-injective R -module. Then $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, D) = 0$ for all torsion-free R -modules M .*

Proof. Let M be a torsion-free R -module. Consider an exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} F \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$, in which F is a free R -module. Then, by Lemma 3.2, the inclusion map i is RD-pure. Now, from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, D) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(F, D) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(K, D) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(M, D) \longrightarrow 0,$$

we deduce that $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, D) = 0$. Note that since D is RD-injective, the map $\text{Hom}_R(i, id_D)$ is surjective. $\square$

Example 3.4. Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local Noetherian domain with $\dim R > 1$. Since R is not a Prüfer domain, it turns out that R possesses an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ which is not projective. Thus $\text{Ext}_R^1(\mathfrak{a}, R/\mathfrak{m}) \neq 0$, by [2, Proposition 1.3.1]. Now, by [3, Theorem 3.6], $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a CP-injective R -module, while by Lemma 3.3, $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is not RD-injective.

The following example shows that the two notions of $\mathcal{S}_2$ -flatness and $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pureness are not the same.

Example 3.5. Assume that R is a Noetherian domain such that $\dim R > 1$. Hence R is not Prüfer, and so by Corollary 2.12, there exists an absolutely CP-module M which is not injective. So, there is an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/\mathfrak{a}, M) \neq 0$. Let E denote the injective envelope of M . Then from the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow M \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{\pi} E/M \longrightarrow 0$ (*), we deduce the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, M) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, E) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, E/M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(R/\mathfrak{a}, M) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Hence the map $\text{Hom}_R(id_{R/\mathfrak{a}}, \pi)$ is not surjective. Thus (*) is an $\mathcal{S}_2$ -flat sequence which is not $\mathcal{S}_2$ -pure.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.W. Brewer and D.L. Costa, *Contracted ideals and purity for ring extensions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **53**(2), (1975), 271-276.
- [2] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **39**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [3] K. Divaani-Aazar, M.A. Esmkhani and M. Tousi, *Some criteria of cyclically pure injective module*, J. of Algebra, to appear.
- [4] M.W. Evans, *On commutative P. P. rings*, Pacific J. Math. **41**, (1972), 687-697.
- [5] A. Facchini, *Relative injectivity and pure-injective modules over Prüfer rings*, J. Algebra **110**(2), (1987), 380-406.
- [6] L. Fuchs, and L. Salce, *Modules over non-Noetherian domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **84**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2001).
- [7] P. Griffith, *On the decomposition of modules and generalized left uniserial rings*, Math. Ann., **184** (1970), 300-308.
- [8] L. Gruson and C.U. Jensen, *Deux applications de la notion de L-dimension*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A, **282**, (1976), 23-24.
- [9] M. Hochster, *Cyclic purity versus purity in excellent Noetherian rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **231**(2) (1977), 463-488.
- [10] C. Megibben, *Absolutely pure modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **26** (1970), 561-566.
- [11] L. Melkersson, *Cohomological properties of modules with secondary representations*, Math. Scand., **77**(2) (1995), 197-208.
- [12] L. Melkersson, *Small cofinite irreducibles*, J. Algebra **196**(2) (1997), 630-645.
- [13] R.B. Warfield, *Purity and algebraic compactness for modules*, Pacific J. Math., **28**, (1969), 699-719.
- [14] R.B. Warfield, *A Krull-Schmidt theorem for infinite sums of modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **22**, (1969), 460-465.
- [15] R.B. Warfield, *Decomposability of finitely presented modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **25**, (1970), 167-172.

K. DIVAANI-AAZAR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AZ-ZAHRA UNIVERSITY, VANAK, POST CODE 19834, TEHRAN, IRAN-AND-INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS, P.O. BOX 19395-5746, TEHRAN, IRAN.

E-mail address: kdivaani@ipm.ir

M.A. ESMKHANI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHID BEHESHTI UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN-AND-INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS, P.O. BOX 19395-5746, TEHRAN, IRAN.

M. TOUSI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHID BEHESHTI UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN-AND-INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS, P.O. BOX 19395-5746, TEHRAN, IRAN.